

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

DAN SCHANTZ FARM & GREENHOUSES,	:	
LLC,	:	Docket No.
	:	5:17-cv-00403-JLS
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
v.	:	JURY DEMAND
	:	
DAVID J. CATANZARO,	:	
Defendant.	:	
	:	

PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO STRIKE
DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE IN
OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS PLAINTIFF'S FIRST
AMENDED COMPLAINT
AND
DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE IN
OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR DISCIPLINARY

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(f) and this Court's Policies and Procedures, namely Section II(C)(2), Plaintiff Dan Schantz Farm & Greenhouses ("DSF&G") respectfully moves to strike Defendant's Response in Opposition to Plaintiff's Response in Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint (Doc. 21) and Defendant's Response in Opposition to Plaintiff's Response in Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Disciplinary Action (Doc. 22) as redundant and merely repetitive of arguments made in Defendant's briefs in support of its underlying Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint (Doc. 16) and Motion for Disciplinary Action (Doc. 17).

Defendant's submissions are effectively reply briefs in support of his motions, which the parties have thoroughly briefed. These reply briefs duplicate the exhibits presented with the motions and restate the substance of Defendant's original briefs in support of the motions before

the Court. For these reasons, Defendant's motions serve merely to detract from the focus and procedural economy of the matters addressed.

Defendant's reply briefs should be stricken.

Respectfully Submitted,

FITZPATRICK LENTZ & BUBBA, P.C.

Date: May 24, 2017

BY: 

Douglas Panzer
PA Bar I.D. #203354
Attorney for Plaintiff
4001 Schoolhouse Lane
P.O. Box 219
Center Valley, PA 18034-0219
(610) 797-9000